

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. 5906 09/998,560 11/29/2001 Kristina Vogt Mo-6644/LeA 34,976 EXAMINER 34947 7590 05/11/2004 BAYER CHEMICALS CORPORATION UMEZ ERONINI, LYNETTE T PATENT DEPARTMENT ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 100 BAYER ROAD PITTSBURGH, PA 15205-9741 1765

DATE MAILED: 05/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/998,560	VOGT ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lynette T. Umez-Eronini	1765	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	ldress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered time the mailing date of this c ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 F</u>	ebruary 2004.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matters, pr	osecution as to the	e merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	. /
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-20 is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 17-20 are subject to restriction and/o 	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		* *	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	, ,	-	• • •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			. 0 102.
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage
Attachment(s)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) ☐ Notice of Informal F 11/12/2003 6) ☐ Other:	ate	D-152)

Art Unit: 1765

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-16 in Paper filed 2/9/2004 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu (US 4,857,290).

As pertaining to claims 1, 8, and 11, Shimizu teaches a process for producing silica comprising: treating an acidic silicate sol composition with hydrogen peroxide, adjusting the pH of the sol to 0 to 5 by adding a base selected form the group consisting of sodium hydroxide and potassium hydroxide (claim 1), which reads on,

A polishing slurry comprising:

- (a) a silica sol that contains SiO2 particles, and
- (b) hydrogen peroxide and a base in an amount that is sufficient to set the pH of the polishing slurry at a pH that falls within the range of 5 to 11.5.

Application/Control Number: 09/998,560

Art Unit: 1765

Shimizu differs in failing to specify from 2.5 to about 70% by volume of silica sol that contains from 15 to 40% by weight SiO₂ particles having a mean particle size of less than 300 nm, 6 to 10% by volume of hydrogen peroxide and the slurry at a 22°C, in claim 1;

the percent by weight of SiO₂ in silica sol, in claims 2-5;

the percent by weight of SiO₂ in the slurry, as specified in claim 6;

the percent by volume of hydrogen peroxide in the slurry, in claim 7;

a pH ranging from 6 to about 10, in claim 9 of the polishing slurry; and

the removal rate of more than 300 A/min, a Cu:Ta selectivity of more than 1:2, a Cu:dielectric selectivity of more than 1:1 or greater, in claim 10.

Shimizu further differs in failing specify from about 2.5 to about 70% by volume of silica sol containing SiO_2 particles, from about 6 to 10% by volume of hydrogen peroxide and the slurry at a 22°C, a Ta removal rate of more than 300 Å/min, a Cu:Ta selectivity of more than 1:2, a Cu:dielectric selectivity of more than 1:1 or greater, and the Ta removal rate is \geq 1.5 times the removal rate of a dielectric that can be polished by the slurry, **in claim 11**;

the mean particle size of less than about 300 nm and the percent by weight of SiO_2 in the silica sol, as recited in claim 12;

the percent by weight of SiO2 in, in claims 13-15; and

the percent by weight of SiO_2 in the slurry, as recited in claim 16.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to use any combination of parameters such as the removal rate, Application/Control Number: 09/998,560

Art Unit: 1765

polish selectivity, pH, temperature, percent by weight and percent by volume of the

components of the slurry as taught in the Shimizu's reference and including those

presented in applicants' claim for the purpose of producing a high purity sol (Shimizu,

column 3, lines 33-40).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Lynette T. Umez-Eronini whose telephone number is

571-272-1470. The examiner is normally unavailable on the First Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NADINE G. NORTON SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 4

Itue

April 22, 2004